

[REDACTED]

From: Jas Bould [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 August 2026 20:30
To: Planning Comments (SMDC)
Subject: SMD/2026/0370
Attachments: IMG_3196.JPG

[REDACTED]

Dear Planning Officer,

I'm writing to object to the above planning application for the conversion of the detached garage at 137 Willow Drive into ancillary residential accommodation.

As the owner of the neighbouring property immediately adjoining the application site, I have concerns regarding whether the proposed accommodation is genuinely ancillary to the main dwelling, as well as concerns regarding residential amenity, over-intensification, parking and access.

I would like to make clear that my concerns are not with the principle of providing genuine ancillary accommodation for family members or occasional guests. Rather, my concern is whether the accommodation proposed is genuinely ancillary to the main dwelling and whether the current application adequately addresses the concerns identified by Staffordshire Moorlands District Council when the previous application for this same building was refused.

1. Previous refusal and outstanding principle concerns

The previous application, reference **SMD/2026/0216**, sought permission for the conversion of the same detached garage into a single holiday-let unit and was refused by Staffordshire Moorlands District Council on 31 July 2026.

The Council's reason for refusal specifically identified concerns arising from the **location, size of the plot, formation of a separate C3 residential unit and the positional relationship with adjacent dwellings**.

The Council concluded that the proposal would result in an **"over intensification of uses in this purely residential area"** and would lead to **"significant noise and disturbance and general intrusion"**, harming the residential amenities of occupants of adjacent dwellings.

The Council subsequently stated that these were **"principle concerns"** which the applicant was unable to overcome.

The current application changes the stated use from a holiday let to ancillary accommodation. However, the location of the building, the size of the plot and its relationship with neighbouring properties remain unchanged.

I therefore ask the Council to carefully consider whether the current proposal genuinely addresses the concerns identified in the previous refusal, rather than whether the description of the proposed use has simply changed.

2. Whether the accommodation is genuinely ancillary

The new Design & Access Statement describes the proposal as ancillary accommodation for the enjoyment of the occupants of the main dwelling and states that it is intended for visiting friends and family.

However, the proposed accommodation is substantially self-contained. It will provide a **kitchenette, living area, one double bedroom and a bathroom**, with its own pedestrian access and rear patio doors.

I recognise that ancillary accommodation can contain its own facilities. However, given that the previous application for the same building was refused partly because the Council considered that it would result in the formation of a separate C3 residential unit, I believe it is important that the Council carefully assesses whether the current proposal is genuinely ancillary in functional terms.

The applicant has previously sought permission to use this same building as a self-contained holiday let. The current application now describes substantially self-contained accommodation within the same building as ancillary

accommodation. I'm not suggesting that the applicant's intentions can be determined from the previous application alone, but I believe this planning history is relevant and warrants careful consideration.

The Design & Access Statement states that the annex will "still rely on the existing dwelling for other functional services", but doesn't identify what those services are.

Given that the proposed accommodation has its own bedroom, bathroom, living area and kitchenette, together with its own external access, I ask the Council to establish what meaningful functional relationship and dependency would remain between the converted garage and the main dwelling.

3. Potential for independent occupation

I would also ask the Council to consider how the proposed ancillary relationship would be maintained in practice.

If the accommodation is approved as ancillary to 137 Willow Drive, there appears to be a potential scenario whereby the owner could occupy the converted garage whilst the main dwelling was occupied or let independently to another household.

In such circumstances, the two buildings could effectively function as separate residential units, despite the description of the converted garage as ancillary accommodation.

This is particularly relevant given that the previous application was refused partly because the Council considered that the proposal would result in the formation of a separate C3 residential unit.

I therefore ask the Council to consider whether the current proposal provides sufficient safeguards to prevent the converted accommodation from becoming independently occupied or functioning as a separate dwelling.

4. Residential amenity – noise, disturbance and general intrusion

The previous refusal expressly identified **significant noise and disturbance and general intrusion** as reasons why the development would harm the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

Those neighbouring relationships have not changed.

The proposed accommodation remains a separate building immediately adjoining existing residential properties and will contain independent living and sleeping accommodation together with bathroom and kitchenette facilities.

Although the current application states that the accommodation will be used by visiting friends and family, the potential impact on neighbouring residents should be considered having regard to the physical arrangement and intensity of the proposed use.

I remain concerned that the additional accommodation could result in increased activity, noise, outdoor use and general disturbance compared with the existing arrangement.

I therefore ask the Council to give particular consideration to the residential amenity concerns already identified in the previous refusal and whether those concerns have genuinely been overcome by the change in the stated use.

5. Over-intensification and character of the estate

Willow Drive is an established residential estate consisting of private dwellings and is a quiet residential environment.

The previous refusal specifically identified the proposal as resulting in an **over-intensification of uses in this purely residential area**.

The current proposal would still introduce additional accommodation within the plot of an existing five-bedroom dwelling. Although it is now described as ancillary, the physical accommodation remains substantially self-contained.

The estate also contains a significant number of garages serving residential properties. If similar garages throughout the estate were converted into additional accommodation, this could cumulatively increase the number of accommodation units within the estate and alter its established residential character and intensity of use.

I therefore ask the Council to consider the cumulative implications of allowing additional self-contained accommodation of this nature within an estate that was designed and developed as a residential environment.

6. Parking and access

The new Design & Access Statement acknowledges that **parking provisions are scarce on the estate** and proposes three parking spaces for the main dwelling and an additional space for the annex.

As the adjoining neighbour, I have direct experience of the practical limitations of the existing parking and access arrangements.

My boundary lies immediately adjacent to the application site, and I've previously experienced vehicles associated with 137 Willow Drive parking on land within my ownership and using the area immediately adjoining my property.

I appreciate that individual past incidents are not determinative of the planning application. However, they demonstrate that the existing arrangement is already constrained in practical terms.

The introduction of additional accommodation, even if described as ancillary, has the potential to increase vehicle movements and demand for parking and manoeuvring space.

I therefore ask the Council to carefully assess whether the proposed parking arrangement is genuinely workable in practice and whether vehicles associated with the additional accommodation can access and leave the site without relying upon or obstructing neighbouring land.

I will provide photographs and supporting evidence of the existing parking and access arrangements with this objection. My Dad's van is on the right, visitors on the left.

7. Restrictive covenant and residential character

Whilst I acknowledge that restrictive covenants are private legal matters and are not determinative in the planning process, the deeds relating to the estate state:

"No trade, business or profession shall be carried out upon the Plot and no building erected thereon shall be used for any purpose other than as a private dwelling."

I recognise that the covenant itself is not a planning policy consideration. However, it provides relevant context regarding the original residential character and intended use of the estate.

The current proposal should therefore be considered in the context of an estate which was established as a residential development rather than one comprising separate accommodation units within individual residential plots.

8. Conditions if permission is considered appropriate

If the Council is satisfied that the proposal constitutes genuinely ancillary accommodation and is minded to grant planning permission, I would ask that an appropriate and enforceable condition is imposed to ensure that the accommodation remains ancillary to the main dwelling.

In particular, I would ask that any permission prevents the building from being:

- occupied as an independent dwelling;
- separately let or occupied independently of the main dwelling;
- used for short-term holiday accommodation; or
- used to accommodate paying guests.

I would also ask that the condition makes clear that the ancillary accommodation cannot be occupied independently whilst the main dwelling is separately occupied or let to another household.

This would provide clarity that the permission relates to genuine ancillary accommodation rather than creating a separate residential unit which could subsequently function independently of the main dwelling.

Conclusion

I respectfully ask the Council to consider the current application in light of the previous refusal of application **SMD/2026/0216**.

The previous refusal identified fundamental concerns regarding the intensity of use of this particular plot, the formation of a separate residential unit, and the resulting noise, disturbance and general intrusion upon neighbouring properties. Those concerns arose from the site's location, plot size and relationship with adjacent dwellings, all of which remain unchanged.

Although the current application describes the proposed use as ancillary accommodation rather than a holiday let, the proposed building remains substantially self-contained, providing living, sleeping, bathroom and kitchenette facilities with its own access.

I therefore don't believe that the application has adequately demonstrated that the principle concerns identified in the previous refusal have been overcome.

I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

If, however, the Council is minded to approve the application, I ask that robust and enforceable conditions are imposed to ensure that the accommodation remains genuinely ancillary to the main dwelling and cannot be used or occupied as a separate dwelling, holiday let or paid guest accommodation.

Yours faithfully,

Jasmine Bould

74 Willow Drive, ST13 7FF